

Serial No. 10/734,429

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated February 9, 2006 (hereinafter the "Office Action"), Examiner requested that Applicant provide copies of relevant portions of the documents incorporated by reference. Applicant is in the process of obtaining these documents, however, Applicant believes that the documents only provide background material and are not essential to the prosecution. Applicant will forward to Examiner the documents when they have been obtained. Applicant also noted an error in the specification and has amended paragraph 28 to correct the error.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-17, and 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawase 2003/0141807 in view of admitted prior art. In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 19 and part of claim 12. Claim 19 has been cancelled. As explained below, Applicant respectfully submits Kawase is insufficient to render a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to amended claim 1.

Kawase does not show using a single transistor with a long channel to control a pixel. Instead, Kawase uses a standard transistor (T1 in Figure 4 which corresponds to transistor 102 in Figure 12) to drive the gate of a driver TFT (T2 in Figure 4 which corresponds to transistor 104 in Figure 12). Only the driver TFT has an unusually long channel. Paragraph 92 of Kawase clearly describes transistor 102 as nothing more than a standard thin film switching transistor and the figure of the transistor appears to confirm that.

In the original claim 12, Applicant claims the gate of the first thin film transistor which has a channel length longer than the shorter pixel dimension is coupled to the gate line. Kawase does not show such a structure, instead, the gate line of the driver TFT of Kawase is coupled to the drain of a standard TFT. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the described limitation of claim 12.

In the original claim 19, the source electrode of the first thin film transistor which has a channel length longer than the shorter pixel dimension is coupled to a data line. Kawase does not show such a structure. Instead, Kawase couples the source


Serial No. 10/734,429

electrode of the driver TFT to a power line. Claim 1 has been amended to include the described limitation of claim 19.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Kawase is insufficient to render a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to amended claim 1. All remaining claims depend on independent claim 1 and thus include the described limitations.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all the case is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent M. Chen  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 39,630  
(714) 565-1158  
June 9, 2006